2.

CERTAIN QUERIES UPON Dr. PIERCES SERMON

At *Whitehall* Feb. 1.

LONDON,
Printed in the Year 1663.

LONDON,
Printed in the Year 1665.

CERTAIN QUERIES UPON D. PEIRCES SERMON

At *White-hall.* Feb. 1.

Querie 1.

WHether it be seasonable at this time to exasperate the supream Magistrate with any aggravations of dissenters opinions, when the dissenters sit down peaceably, and grant themselves erroneous; and therefore desire a toleration only for what is publickly judged an errour, and not the establishment of any thing, to be publickly allowed as truth? If we the Hererodox part of this

Nation were in the right, we would crave publick countenance and settlement, whereas now we humbly desire only publick favour and indulgence as those that are presumed to be in the wrong; and therefore it is but lost labour to spend whole Sermons to prove that we are so?

Qu. 2.

To what end was this discourse directed? not to confirm his Majesty in the errour of our wayes? for he had declared his resolution against our doctrine before; not that I have hope to widen the breach between us: for that is not the work of a Minister of the Gospel of peace, not to instruct the people, for they can never satisfy themselver by your discourse, which leads them to fathers and other authours they do not know, to such quotations as they know not whether they are wrested or not: not to convert us who you knew should not hear you: nor when we have heard you, should we with freedom offer our selves against what you say, which must be this since we are converted?

Qu. 3.

But supposing, your discourse, seasonable and useful, what do you mean by that which was from the beginning? do you mean primitive examples, or primitive rules? if you mean primitive examples, they are not a rule of Reformation, because we are not to do as *men have done*, but as *men ought to do*? If you mean primitive rules, you mean either the Scripture, or something added to it, not any thing added to it: for you say *Cursed is he that addeth any thing to it, or taketh away any thing from it*? and if you mean the Scripture it self, the *Query* is, Wrether *it be a rule of reformation*, as some men understand it, or as all men do: not as all men do, for then either we should have no refor-

ma-

mation, all men never agreeing to the rule of it: or we must have as many reformations as there are opinions in the world; and as you reform beyond us, according to your sense of Scripture, so the *Presbyterian* reforms beyond you in his sense of it, and the *Fanatick* beyond him according to his sense, and *primitive rule of Reformation*? If as some men do understand the Scripture it be a rule of Reformation, then either as you do, or as we do? If you say as you do, you are partial in your selves, and you allow your selves what you with so much bitterness deny us to be Lords *over mens faith, to be judges of controversies*? If as we do, then you in your whole *discourse have beaten the air, you have prevailed in vain, and they have heard in vain.*

Qu. 4.

Whether when you have earnestly contended against the novelties of the Church of *Rome*, you have contended, as you say, *for that which was from the beginning*, seeing you contended only for the old Protestant way? And that besides the Church of *Rome*, the Eastern Churches claim a greater antiquity than yours; and if Popery were down, there are a world of Sects and Sects that desire no more than to try with you out of the Scripture, and that *which was from the beginning, the whole throng of non-conformists cry, To the Law and to the Testimony*, i. e. *Let us worship God according to the Scripture, Let us serve God in spirit and in truth*, as he was served in *the beginning, you teach for doctrines the traditions of men, making the Commandments of God of none effect*. And you know who it was that said, the Scotch way comes neerest the primitive way than either yours (meaning the Catholick, and speaking to a Catholick Gentleman) or ours, meaning the old Protestant, and indeed.

Qu. 5.

What pains you put your ſelves upon, when you ſay we muſt reduce all things to what they were in the *beginning*? where do you find (ſaith the *Fanatick*) Lordbiſhops in the beginning? where were the Biſhops Courts in the beginning? where was Infant Baptiſm in the beginning? where was your Sunday a Sabbath in the beginning? you uſe Croſs, Surplice, Copes, Altars, Organs, Church-muſick, but in the beginning it was not ſo? you impoſe upon tender conſciences, ſay they? you undoe poor men for things in themſelves indifferent: you hinder men to preach the Goſpel, neceſſary to ſalvation, for things in themſelves not neceſſary to ſalvation, in the beginning it was not ſo: you ſing your prayers, you uſe vain repetitions, you pray by book they ſay, in the beginning it was not ſo: you, they ſay, have rich Biſhopricks, Deanaries, Prebendaries, Sinecures, Pluralities (as you your ſelf Dr. *Benit* are Rector of *Brington*, Preſident of *Magdalen* Colledge in *Oxford*, Prebend of *Canterbury*, Canon of *York*, Chaplain to his Majeſty) in the beginning it was not ſo: you have Lay-chancellors, Officials, Surrogates, Faculty-men, promoters, and a whole train (as they call them) of Popiſh officers, they tell you in the beginning it was not ſo: you preach in Gowns, you pray and preach by the hour-glaſs, you meet in Steeple-houſes, you are called Maſters, you preach for hire, in the beginning (ſaith another ſort) it was not ſo: the Queſtion is then whether by examining our way by *what there was in the beginning*? you have not taught others to examine yours ſo too, and to caſt off the authority of your way for a new reformation, as you have caſt off the authority of ours for an old one, and whether you will not as little bear the reſt of the Scripture, and the primitive times, in the *Preſ-*

by-

byterian ſenſe of them, as you think we can bear the reſt of them in your ſenſe of them?

Qu. 6.

Why ſhould the Diſciplinarians, *i. e.* the *Presbyterians*, deny themſelves from *Aerius*, as you ſay *p.* 7. who only ſaid, that *a Biſhop is no more a Miniſter than any other Miniſter*, rather than from St. *Peter*, who 1 *Pet.* 5. 12. ſaith, *he was no more though an Apoſtle, than an ordinary Presbyter.* The Presbyters that are among you I exhort, who alſo am a Presbyter, Feed the flock of God which is among you, performing the office of Biſhops, or from *Clemens Romanus*, who ſaith Presbyters and Biſhops are one: why ſhould the reprobatorious derive themſelves from *Simon Magus*, who believed no eternal way to which men might be reprobated, or the *Manichees*, who only taught fate in things of this world, either than from the Apoſtle *Paul*, who writes of God thus, that before the children had done either good or evil, he ſays, *Jacob have I loved, Eſau have I hated. He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.* Why ſhould the *Solifidians* and *Antinomians* derive themſelves from *Eunomius*, who only ſaid, *That the Law ſaves us not, but faith*; or from miſunderſtanding, the Scripture, which ſaith, *We are not ſaved by the works of the law, but by faith.* And the *Anabaptiſts* and *Sovinians* look not upon *Agrippinus* and *Subellus*, who thought no ſuch thing: however you miſtake them in your curſory, and light way of reading and writing, but they all look as you adviſe them upon the Scripture, which (according to the Liberty you take your ſelves and all on them) they underſtand every one as he pleaſeth: you ſay you muſt aſk every one how he reads in the beginning, and the Anabaptiſts ſaith he reads *Repent, believe* (which he ſaith a child cannot do) *and be Baptized*: The Socinian reads, *The Father is*

higher

higher then I: The Millonary reads, and they *lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*

Quer. 7.

And why should the Papists derive their infallibility from the Gnosticks, who only said, *that every one may know all that is required to save him,* rather then from the Scripture, which saith, *to Peter thy faith shall not fail; which speaks of full assurance of faith; of the impossibility of deceiving the Elect; of the Church being the* pillar and ground of the truth, *against which the gates of hell shall not prevaile.* Why must the *Romanists* have their Purgatory from *Tertullian*, or *Montanus*, or the *Heathens*, (though truth is never the worse for being among them, for their errours and corruptions as you say the Papists were blinded with many doctrines most sound and Orthodox) rather then from the beginning, when it is written that some shall be saved, *yet so as by fire*; that Christ preached *to the spirits in prison*: why should you onely upon the Emperour *Maximilian* the second's words, who was forced by Protestants to write that Letter in *Thuanus*, said that Priests marriage was never forbidden untill *Calvin*'s time; when S. *Paul* adviseth them not to marry, and that they that goe a warfare do not entangle themselves with the affairs of this life: and our Saviour saith that in the Kingdome, or under the Gospel; as your beloved *Hammond* and *Grotius* explains it, you shall be as the *Angels*, who neither marry, nor are given in marriage; and you know the Priests are called the Angels of the Churches, & they are the Virgins that follow the Lamb: why should quote we *Scotus* that transubstantiation was not a truth before the *Lateran* Council, whereas he saith onely forecast till then, whereas indeed, it was a truth since Christ said *This is my Body, this is my Blood*; and the Apostle saith he that eats or drinks it unworthily, eats or drinks his own damnation;

damnation: no man is damned for eating a piece of bread, or drinking a drop of wine ſure: therfore the bread and wine is the body and bloud of Chriſt. Why ſhould you ſay that the half-Communion was onely ſince *Tho. Aquinas*: when you do not find in the *beginning* any whole Communion? did Chriſt give the wine to any but Diſciples or Miniſters? did the Apoſtle in the 11. of the *Cerimbians* ſay any more but that the Lord did ſuffer death; not the Scripture ſaid that the Chriſtians went from houſe to houſe onely breaking of bread: And your *Vaſquez* ſaith no more but that it was uſed in the Latine Church, he doth not ſay it was allowed; and indeed here once for all, I muſt needs ſay, that though you tell the King and the world, that your quotations are the uſefuleſt part of your performance, as being the warrant and evidence of all the reſt, yet when we examine them they are either miſquoted, or impertinently uſed, was not the Jewiſh Liturgy in the Hebrew for all Nations, Tongues and Languages for Jews and Proſelytes? were not the primitive Liturgies in Greek and Latine? and is *Publick Prayer before the people in an unknown tongue onely preached*, as for a form *Gregory* the *Great*: as bad manners occaſioned Pope *Gregory's* decree, which eſtabliſhed that by an Eccleſiaſtical Law, which was already eſtabliſhed by primitive practice. If Invocation of Saints, when not heard of in S. *Auſtin's* dayes, it was heard of in S. *Clement's* dayes, and *Ignatius's*: if thoſe Epiſtles and genuine, the univerſal Supremacy of the Pope was from S. *Peter* by Right, though it pleaſed God he could not get his right untill *Boniface* the third's time, who gave him that *actually*, which he had *rightfully* before; ſo that touching theſe *errours* as you call them, we may ſay *from the beginning it was ſo.*

Qu. 8.

Whether God from the beginning of the world before, under, or after the Law, allowed Liberty for variety of Constitution, in several Countries professing one Religion? were not all the world under one way before Christ: is not all the world under one Faith, one Baptisme, &c. one way since Christ; be of one accord, of one mind: what is a particular Church? is not a particular Congregation under one Pastor meeting in the same place; if so, why do not you suffer the several congregations in *England* to enjoy their own Liberty in indifferent things? is it a Nation? where do you read that every Nation should have it's own way of serving God, or do you not rather read that they should be all *of one heart, and of one way*.

Qu. 9.

In dutiful conformity to which example say you? the reformers here in *England*, &c. Were the Reformers here in *England* members of the *Roman* Church, or were they not? if they were not, they were of no Church, there being none then visible, and so were no Christians, and so not fit to reform a Christian Church: if they were members of the *Roman* Church, could they the members reform the Church? if they could, why may not other members of your Church which desire a further reformation, reform yours.

Qu. 10.

Whether the Council of *Trent* may not as well adde several points to be delivered, upon pain of damnation, as well as you adde several things to be done upon pain of damnation; especially when as you say the things themselves

ſelves bind not unto damnation, but the power that enjoins them: ſo thoſe articles require not a belief upon pain of damnation, but the Church that eſtabliſheth them.

Qu. 11.

But having recourſe to the Scriptures, and the primitive Fathers of the Church, &c. where did they find the Scripture and the Primitive Fathers? did they not find them in the Church? and muſt they run from the Church to goe to the Fathers and Scriptures? you ſay that as the Papiſts ſeparate *from the Primitive Chriſtians, ſo the Reformers did from them*: what Chriſtians did the Papiſts ſeparate from, when there were no Chriſtians but in the Church of *Rome*? all the Religion that was then in the world was in the Church of *Rome*, all Chriſtians holding Communion with it; and therefore as *Rome* could not make a ſchiſme unleſſe from it ſelf: ſo the need hath made ſchiſme from *Rome*.

Qu. 12.

Whether the Proteſtants, leaving the Church of *Rome*, was not the leaving of the Scripture, the Primitive Church, and the four general Councils which are all owned in *Rome*?

Qu. 13.

Whether though the Goſpel was preached *at Jeruſalem* (as you ſay) to the *Jews*, yet *Rome* may not be the mother Church of the Gentiles?

Qu. 14.

Whether *Gildas*'s Report of Chriſtianity in *Britain*, the firſt time of *Tiberius*, doe not make the *Britiſh* Church ſubject to the See of Rome, eſpecially ſeeing *Gildas* in the ſame Epiſtle, ſaith that Chriſtianity was brought hither by S. *Peter*?

Qu. 15.

FINIS.

Qu. 15.

Whether you do well to tell us of *Phocas* and his displeasure concurring, when you consider what *H.* the 8. was, and his displeasure to the Pope.

Qu. 16.

Whether though the wall of Gods City hath twelve foundations, it have not a corner stone too: and whether by your own confession St. *Peter* did not seeme to be a pillar? Whether St. *Paul* did not rebuke the high Priest as well as St. *Peter*; but yet came with an, *I wished not that he was an high Priest*: whether St. *Peter* might not give St. *Paul* and St. *Barnabas* the right hand of fellowship in humility; though he had a hand over them in authority; as the Pope is Servant of servants in humility, though he be Lord of Kings in authority, whether it be any honour for *Paul* to be an heathen or a Gentile Apostle, whereas his chief glory is, that he was an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as St. *Peter* was before him: whether the Pope Lords over Gods heritage, when he is only a servant of their faith; the servant of the servants of God, according to our Saviours Saying, he that would be the chiefest among you, shall be the servants of all: you the first reformers say, the Pope should not Lord it over Gods heritage, and other Reformers say, the Lords Bishops should not Lord it over Gods heritage, for say they too as you do, *they that rule over the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them*, which Reformers shall we hearken to.

The end of the first Part.

There is a man that seemeth just in his own cause, another cometh and findeth him out.

FINIS.

135550